



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. 6

COPY MAILED

SEP 03 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

MARY ROGDE
46-285 IKIHI ST.
KANE OHE HI 96744

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| In re Application of | : | |
| Mary Rogde | : | |
| Application No. 09/935,562 | : | DECISION ON PETITION UNDER |
| Filed: August 21, 2001 | : | 37 C.F.R. §§1.137(A) |
| Title: SOLAR DESALINATION PLANT | : | |

This is a decision on the petition filed September 2, 2003, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a)¹ to revive the above-identified application.

The Office regrets the delay in issuing this decision.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action, mailed October 10, 2002, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. No response was received, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) were requested. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on January 11, 2003. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed June 4, 2003.

With the instant petition, Petitioner has supplied the fee associated with the filing of a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a), an amendment, and a statement of facts.

Petitioner has met requirements (1) - (2) above. Requirement (4) does not apply.

¹ A grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR §1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the required reply (in a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application; in an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof);
- (2) the petition fee;
- (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable, and;
- (4) a terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in §1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

Regarding the third requirement above, the showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 37 CFR §1.137(a).

The Commissioner is responsible for determining the standard for unavoidable delay and for applying that standard

35 USC §133 states, “Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.” (emphasis added)

“In the specialized field of patent law, ... the Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks is primarily responsible for the application and enforcement of the various narrow and technical statutory and regulatory provisions. His interpretation of those provisions is entitled to considerable deference.”²

The standard

“[T]he question of whether an applicant’s delay in prosecuting an application was unavoidable must be decided on a case-by-case basis, taking all of the facts and circumstances into account.”³

The general question asked by the Office is: “Did petitioner act as a reasonable and prudent person in relation to his most important business?”⁴

Nonawareness of a PTO rule will not constitute unavoidable delay⁵.

² Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F.Supp. 900, 904, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA)1876 (D.D.C. 1990), aff’d without opinion (Rule 36), 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (citing Morganroth v. Quigg, 885 F.2d 843, 848, 12 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1989); Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg, 849 F.2d 1422, 1425, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1152 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (“an agency’ interpretation of a statute it administers is entitled to deference”); see also Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 467 U.S. 837, 844, 81 L. Ed. 694, 104 S. Ct. 2778 (1984) (“if the statute is silent or ambiguous with respect to the specific issue, the question for the court is whether the agency’s answer is based on a permissible construction of the statute.”)

³ Id.

⁴ See In re Mattulah, 38 App. D.C. 497 (D.C. Cir. 1912).

⁵ See Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 977 (Fed. Cir. 1982) (citing Potter v. Dann, 201 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 574 (D.D.C. 1978) for the proposition that counsel’s nonawareness of PTO rules does not constitute “unavoidable” delay)). Although court decisions have only addressed the issue of lack of knowledge of an attorney, there is no reason to expect a different result due to lack of knowledge on the part of a pro se (one who prosecutes on his own) applicant. It would be inequitable for a court to determine that a client who spends his hard earned money on an attorney who happens not to know a specific rule should be held to a higher standard than a pro se applicant who makes (or is forced to make) the decision to file the application without the assistance of counsel.

The burden of showing the cause of the delay is on the person seeking to revive the application⁶.

A delay caused by an applicant's lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice, or the MPEP is not rendered "unavoidable" due to either the applicant's reliance upon oral advice from USPTO employees or the USPTO's failure to advise the applicant to take corrective action⁷.

The law, regulations and portion of the MPEP relevant to the abandonment of this application

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Director in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Director that such delay was unavoidable.

§ 1.111 Reply by applicant or patent owner to a non-final Office action.

(a)

(1) If the Office action after the first examination (§ 1.104) is adverse in any respect, the applicant or patent owner, if he or she persists in his or her application for a patent or reexamination proceeding, must reply and request reconsideration or further examination, with or without amendment. See §§ 1.135 and 1.136 for time for reply to avoid abandonment.

(2) A second (or subsequent) supplemental reply will be entered unless disapproved by the Director. A second (or subsequent) supplemental reply may be disapproved if the second (or subsequent) supplemental reply unduly interferes with an Office action being prepared in response to the previous reply. Factors that will be considered in disapproving a second (or subsequent) supplemental reply include:

(i) The state of preparation of an Office action responsive to the previous reply as of the date of receipt (§ 1.6) of the second (or subsequent) supplemental reply by the Office; and

(ii) The nature of any changes to the specification or claims that would result from entry of the second (or subsequent) supplemental reply.

(b) In order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must reply to the Office action. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner's action and must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. If the reply is with respect to an application, a request may be made that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. The applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application or the reexamination proceeding to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section.

(c) In amending in reply to a rejection of claims in an application or patent under reexamination, the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. The applicant or patent owner must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

[46 FR 29182, May 29, 1981; para. (b) revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997; paras. (a) and (c) revised, 65 FR 54604, Sept. 8, 2000, effective Nov. 7, 2000; para. (a)(2) revised, 68 FR 14332, Mar. 25, 2003, effective May 1, 2003]

⁶ Id.

⁷ See In re Sivertz, 227 USPQ 255, 256 (Comm'r Pat. 1985).

37 C.F.R. 1.135: Abandonment for failure to reply within time period.

- (a) If an applicant of a patent application fails to reply within the time period provided under § 1.134 and § 1.136, the application will become abandoned unless an Office action indicates otherwise.
- (b) Prosecution of an application to save it from abandonment pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section must include such complete and proper reply as the condition of the application may require. The admission of, or refusal to admit, any amendment after final rejection or any amendment not responsive to the last action, or any related proceedings, will not operate to save the application from abandonment.
- (c) When reply by the applicant is a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action, and is substantially a complete reply to the non-final Office action, but consideration of some matter or compliance with some requirement has been inadvertently omitted, applicant may be given a new time period for reply under § 1.134 to supply the omission.

[Paras. (a), (b), and (c), 47 FR 41276, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982; para. (d) deleted, 49 FR 555, Jan. 4, 1984, effective Apr. 1, 1984; revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997]

711.03(c) of the MPEP sets forth, in part:

The required reply to a non-final action in a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute may be either:

- (A) an argument or an amendment under 37 CFR 1.111;
- (B) the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b) (or a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) if the application is a utility or plant application filed before May 29, 2000, or a design application). The grant of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 is not a determination that any reply under 37 CFR 1.111 is complete. Where the proposed reply is to a non-final Office action, the petition may be granted if the reply appears to be bona fide. After revival of the application, the patent examiner may, upon more detailed review, determine that the reply is lacking in some respect. In this limited situation, the patent examiner should send out a letter giving a 1-month shortened statutory period under 37 CFR 1.135(c) for correction of the error or omission. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. If applicant does not correct the omission within the time period set in the letter (including any extension), the application is again abandoned.

...

The dismissal or denial of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) does not preclude an applicant from obtaining relief pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) on the basis of unintentional delay (unless the decision dismissing or denying the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) indicates otherwise). In such an instance, a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) may be filed accompanied by the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m), the required reply, a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, and any terminal disclaimer required by 37 CFR 1.137(c).

Application of the standard to the current facts and circumstances

Unfortunately, petitions filed under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) (where the cause of the abandonment is characterized as “unavoidable”) have a very stringent standard associated with them.

With the instant petition, Petitioner has alleged that preparing her response was a rather involved affair, and the timeframe which was provided to her proved to be insufficient.

Petitioner’s argument has been considered, and it has been deemed to be unpersuasive. Unfortunately, 35 U.S.C. §133 sets a statutory requirement which mandates the furtherance of the prosecution of an application prior to the expiration of the period for response, unless it can be shown that the delay was unavoidable.

Petitioner has asserted that due to the large number of mistakes which needed to be corrected, coupled with the fact that a colleague in India needed to be consulted, it simply was not possible to submit the required reply in under eleven months. It does not seem likely that in the age of e-mail, video-conferencing, and faxes, a reasonable and prudent person acting in relation to her most important business would require close to a year to correct her submission.

Therefore, it is determined that delay was perhaps unintentional, but certainly not unavoidable.

As such, the petition must be **DISMISSED**.

Alternate venue

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a petition to revive based on unintentional abandonment under 37 CFR §1.137(b). Petitioner should note that the standard associated with the filing of an unintentional petition is significantly lower than that associated with the characterization of an abandonment as unavoidable. A grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR §1.137(b) must be accompanied by the required reply (already submitted), the required petition fee (currently \$665 for a small entity), and a statement that the **entire** delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR §1.137(b) was unintentional. A copy of a blank petition form may be found at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/forms/sb0064.pdf>.

The filing of a petition under 37 CFR §1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed, and therefore, must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR §1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR §1.137(b).

Response

Any reply must be submitted within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reply should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) *and/or* §1.137(b), *if applicable*." This is not a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C 704.

The renewed petition should display "Please deliver to Paul Shanoski, c/o Office of Petitions" in a prominent manner.

To help assure prompt and proper attention to your response, please see the enclosed Request for Alert Concerning Submitted Petitions, 1282 Official Gazette (May 18, 2004) for further information on how to assist the Office in delivering your submission to the correct location. The Petitioner may wish to consider telephoning the undersigned one month after the submission is made to confirm that the documents were properly delivered.

Any renewed petition may be submitted by mail⁸, hand-delivery⁹, or facsimile¹⁰.

The application file will be retained in the Office of Petitions for two (2) months.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-0011.

Please note that on approximately September 28, 2004, the Office of Petitions will relocate to the new PTO location in Alexandria. Although the mailing address will remain the same, the general phone number for the Office of Petitions which should be used for status requests will change to 571-272-3282, and the telephone number for the undersigned will change to 571-272-3225.



Paul Shanowski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Encl. Request for Alert Concerning Submitted Petitions, 1282 Official Gazette (May 18, 2004)

⁸ Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

⁹ Customer Window, Mail Stop Petition, Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03, Arlington, Virginia 22202.

¹⁰ (703) 872-9306 - please note this is a central facsimile number, and as such, there will be a delay in the delivery of the facsimile to the undersigned.